arXiv:1105.0729v2 [math.AP] 6 Apr 2012

LOW MACH NUMBER LIMIT FOR THE MULTI-DIMENSIONAL FULL MAGNETOHYDRODYNAMIC EQUATIONS

SONG JIANG, QIANGCHANG JU, AND FUCAI LI

Abstract. The low Mach number limit for the multi-dimensional full magnetohydrodynamic equations, in which the effect of thermal conduction is taken into account, is rigorously justified in the framework of classical solutions with small density and temperature variations. Moreover, we show that for sufficiently small Mach number, the compressible magnetohydrodynamic equations admit a smooth solution on the time interval where the smooth solution of the incompressible magnetohydrodynamic equations exists. In addition, the low Mach number limit for the ideal magnetohydrodynamic equations with small entropy variation is also investigated. The convergence rates are obtained in both cases.

1. Introduction

The magnetohydrodynamic (MHD) equations govern the motion of compressible quasi-neutrally ionized fluids under the influence of electromagnetic fields. The full three-dimensional compressible MHD equations read as (see, e.g., [12, 15, 22, 23])

$$\partial_t\rho + \operatorname{div}(\rho\mathbf{u}) = 0, \tag{1.1}$$

$$\partial_t(\rho\mathbf{u}) + \operatorname{div}(\rho\mathbf{u}\otimes\mathbf{u}) + \nabla p = \frac{1}{4\pi}(\nabla\times\mathbf{H})\times\mathbf{H} + \operatorname{div}\Psi, \tag{1.2}$$

$$\partial_t\mathbf{H} - \nabla\times(\mathbf{u}\times\mathbf{H}) = -\nabla\times(\nu\nabla\times\mathbf{H}), \quad \operatorname{div}\mathbf{H} = 0, \tag{1.3}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t\mathcal{E} + \operatorname{div}(\mathbf{u}(\mathcal{E}'+p)) = {}& \frac{1}{4\pi}\operatorname{div}((\mathbf{u}\times\mathbf{H})\times\mathbf{H}) \\ & + \operatorname{div}\Big(\frac{\nu}{4\pi}\mathbf{H}\times(\nabla\times\mathbf{H}) + \mathbf{u}\Psi + \kappa\nabla\theta\Big).\end{aligned} \tag{1.4}$$

Here $x\in\Omega$, and Ω is assumed to be the whole $\mathbb{R}^3$ or the torus $\mathbb{T}^3$. The unknowns ρ denotes the density, $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, u_3)\in\mathbb{R}^3$ the velocity, $\mathbf{H} = (H_1, H_2, H_3)\in\mathbb{R}^3$ the magnetic field, and θ the temperature, respectively; Ψ is the viscous stress tensor given by

$$\Psi = 2\mu\mathbb{D}(\mathbf{u}) + \lambda\operatorname{div}\mathbf{u}\,\mathbf{I}_3$$

Date: January 20, 2013.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 76W05, 35B40.

Key words and phrases. Full MHD equations, smooth solution, low Mach number limit.

with $\mathbb{D}(\mathbf{u}) = (\nabla\mathbf{u} + \nabla\mathbf{u}^\top)/2$, $\mathbf{I}_3$ being the 3×3 identity matrix, and $\nabla\mathbf{u}^\top$ the transpose of the matrix $\nabla\mathbf{u}$; $\mathcal{E}$ is the total energy given by $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}' + |\mathbf{H}|^2/(8\pi)$ and $\mathcal{E}' = \rho\left(e + |\mathbf{u}|^2/2\right)$ with e being the internal energy, $\rho|\mathbf{u}|^2/2$ the kinetic energy, and $|\mathbf{H}|^2/(8\pi)$ the magnetic energy. The viscosity coefficients λ and μ of the flow satisfy $2\mu + 3\lambda > 0$ and $\mu > 0$; $\nu > 0$ is the magnetic diffusion coefficient of the magnetic field, and $\kappa > 0$ is the heat conductivity. For simplicity, we assume that μ, λ, ν and κ are constants. The equations of state $p = p(\rho, \theta)$ and $e = e(\rho, \theta)$ relate the pressure p and the internal energy e to the density ρ and the temperature θ of the flow.

The MHD equations have attracted a lot of attention of physicists and mathematicians because of its physical importance, complexity, rich phenomena, and mathematical challenges, see, for example, [2, 4–6, 8, 9, 11–13, 23, 31] and the references cited therein. One of the important topics on the equations (1.1)–(1.4) is to study its low Mach number limit. For the isentropic MHD equations, the low Mach number limit has been rigorously proved in [14, 16, 17, 20]. Nevertheless, it is more significant and difficult to study the limit for the non-isentropic models from both physical and mathematical points of view.

The main purpose of this paper is to present the rigorous justification of the low Mach number limit for the full MHD equations (1.1)-(1.4) in the framework of classical solutions.

Now, we rewrite the energy equation (1.4) in the form of the internal energy. Multiplying (1.2) by $\mathbf{u}$ and (1.3) by $\mathbf{H}/(4\pi)$, and summing them together, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt}\Big(\frac{1}{2}\rho|\mathbf{u}|^2 + \frac{1}{8\pi}|\mathbf{H}|^2\Big) + \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{div}\Big(\rho|\mathbf{u}|^2\mathbf{u}\Big) + \nabla p\cdot\mathbf{u} \\ &\quad = \mathrm{div}\Psi\cdot\mathbf{u} + \frac{1}{4\pi}(\nabla\times\mathbf{H})\times\mathbf{H}\cdot\mathbf{u} + \frac{1}{4\pi}\nabla\times(\mathbf{u}\times\mathbf{H})\cdot\mathbf{H} \\ &\qquad - \frac{\nu}{4\pi}\nabla\times(\nabla\times\mathbf{H})\cdot\mathbf{H}. \end{aligned} \tag{1.5}$$

Using the identities

$$\mathrm{div}(\mathbf{H}\times(\nabla\times\mathbf{H})) = |\nabla\times\mathbf{H}|^2 - \nabla\times(\nabla\times\mathbf{H})\cdot\mathbf{H} \tag{1.6}$$

and

$$\mathrm{div}((\mathbf{u}\times\mathbf{H})\times\mathbf{H}) = (\nabla\times\mathbf{H})\times\mathbf{H}\cdot\mathbf{u} + \nabla\times(\mathbf{u}\times\mathbf{H})\cdot\mathbf{H}, \tag{1.7}$$

and subtracting (1.5) from (1.4), we obtain the internal energy equation

$$\partial_t(\rho e) + \mathrm{div}(\rho\mathbf{u}e) + (\mathrm{div}\mathbf{u})p = \frac{\nu}{4\pi}|\nabla\times\mathbf{H}|^2 + \Psi : \nabla\mathbf{u} + \kappa\Delta\theta, \tag{1.8}$$

where $\Psi : \nabla\mathbf{u}$ denotes the scalar product of two matrices:

$$\Psi : \nabla\mathbf{u} = \sum_{i,j=1}^{3}\frac{\mu}{2}\left(\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial u_j}{\partial x_i}\right)^2 + \lambda|\mathrm{div}\mathbf{u}|^2 = 2\mu|\mathbb{D}(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon)|^2 + \lambda(\mathrm{tr}\mathbb{D}(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon))^2.$$

In this paper, we shall focus our study on the ionized fluid obeying the perfect gas relations

$$p = \Re\rho\theta, \quad e = c_V\theta, \tag{1.9}$$

where the constants $\Re, c_V > 0$ are the gas constant and the heat capacity at constant volume, respectively. We point out here that our analysis below can be applied to more general equations of state for p and e by employing minor modifications in arguments.

To study the low Mach number limit of the system (1.1)–(1.3) and (1.8), we use its appropriate dimensionless form as follows (see the Appendix for the details)

$$\partial_t\rho + \mathrm{div}(\rho\mathbf{u}) = 0, \tag{1.10}$$

$$\rho(\partial_t\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla\mathbf{u}) + \frac{\nabla(\rho\theta)}{\epsilon^2} = (\nabla\times\mathbf{H})\times\mathbf{H} + \mathrm{div}\Psi, \tag{1.11}$$

$$\partial_t\mathbf{H} - \nabla\times(\mathbf{u}\times\mathbf{H}) = -\nabla\times(\nu\nabla\times\mathbf{H}), \quad \mathrm{div}\mathbf{H} = 0, \tag{1.12}$$

$$\rho(\partial_t\theta + \mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla\theta) + (\gamma-1)\rho\theta\mathrm{div}\mathbf{u} = \epsilon^2\nu|\nabla\times\mathbf{H}|^2 + \epsilon^2\Psi : \nabla\mathbf{u} + \kappa\Delta\theta, \tag{1.13}$$

where $\epsilon = M$ is the Mach number and the coefficients μ, λ, ν and κ are the scaled parameters. $\gamma = 1 + \Re/c_V$ is the ratio of specific heats. Note that we have used the same notations and assumed that the coefficients μ, λ, ν and κ are independent of ϵ for simplicity. Also, we have ignored the Cowling number in the equations (1.10)–(1.13), since it does not create any mathematical difficulties in our analysis.

We shall study the limit as $\epsilon \to 0$ of the solutions to (1.10)–(1.13). We further restrict ourselves to the small density and temperature variations, i.e.

$$\rho = 1 + \epsilon q, \quad \theta = 1 + \epsilon\phi. \tag{1.14}$$

We first give a formal analysis. Putting (1.14) and (1.9) into the system (1.10)–(1.13), and using the identities

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{curl}\,\mathrm{curl}\,\mathbf{H} &= \nabla\,\mathrm{div}\mathbf{H} - \Delta\mathbf{H}, \\ \nabla(|\mathbf{H}|^2) &= 2\mathbf{H}\cdot\nabla\mathbf{H} + 2\mathbf{H}\times\mathrm{curl}\,\mathbf{H}, \end{aligned} \tag{1.15}$$

$$\mathrm{curl}\,(\mathbf{u}\times\mathbf{H}) = \mathbf{u}(\mathrm{div}\mathbf{H}) - \mathbf{H}(\mathrm{div}\mathbf{u}) + \mathbf{H}\cdot\nabla\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla\mathbf{H}, \tag{1.16}$$

then we can rewrite (1.10)–(1.13) as

$$\partial_t q^\epsilon + \mathbf{u}^\epsilon\cdot\nabla q^\epsilon + \frac{1}{\epsilon}(1+\epsilon q^\epsilon)\mathrm{div}\mathbf{u}^\epsilon = 0, \tag{1.17}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &(1+\epsilon q^\epsilon)(\partial_t\mathbf{u}^\epsilon + \mathbf{u}^\epsilon\cdot\nabla\mathbf{u}^\epsilon) + \frac{1}{\epsilon}\big[(1+\epsilon q^\epsilon)\nabla\phi^\epsilon + (1+\epsilon\phi^\epsilon)\nabla q^\epsilon\big] \\ &\qquad - \mathbf{H}^\epsilon\cdot\nabla\mathbf{H}^\epsilon + \frac{1}{2}\nabla(|\mathbf{H}^\epsilon|^2) = 2\mu\mathrm{div}(\mathbb{D}(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon)) + \lambda\nabla(\mathrm{tr}\mathbb{D}(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon)), \end{aligned} \tag{1.18}$$

$$\partial_t\mathbf{H}^\epsilon + \mathbf{u}^\epsilon\cdot\nabla\mathbf{H}^\epsilon + \mathrm{div}\mathbf{u}^\epsilon\mathbf{H}^\epsilon - \mathbf{H}^\epsilon\cdot\nabla\mathbf{u}^\epsilon = \nu\Delta\mathbf{H}^\epsilon, \quad \mathrm{div}\mathbf{H}^\epsilon = 0, \tag{1.19}$$

$$\begin{aligned}(1+\epsilon q^\epsilon)(\partial_t\phi^\epsilon+\mathbf{u}^\epsilon\cdot\nabla\phi^\epsilon)+\frac{\gamma-1}{\epsilon}(1+\epsilon q^\epsilon)(1+\epsilon\phi^\epsilon)\mathrm{div}\mathbf{u}^\epsilon\\ =\kappa\Delta\phi^\epsilon+\epsilon(2\mu|\mathbb{D}(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon)|^2+\lambda(\mathrm{tr}\mathbb{D}(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon))^2)+\nu\epsilon|\nabla\times\mathbf{H}^\epsilon|^2.\end{aligned} \tag{1.20}$$

Here we have added the superscript ϵ on the unknowns to stress the dependence of the parameter ϵ. Therefore, the formal limit as $\epsilon\to 0$ of (1.17)–(1.19) is the following incompressible MHD equations (suppose that the limits $\mathbf{u}^\epsilon\to\mathbf{w}$ and $\mathbf{H}^\epsilon\to\mathbf{B}$ exist.)

$$\partial_t\mathbf{w}+\mathbf{w}\cdot\nabla\mathbf{w}+\nabla\pi+\frac{1}{2}\nabla(|\mathbf{B}|^2)-\mathbf{B}\cdot\nabla\mathbf{B}=\mu\Delta\mathbf{w}, \tag{1.21}$$

$$\partial_t\mathbf{B}+\mathbf{w}\cdot\nabla\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{B}\cdot\nabla\mathbf{w}=\nu\Delta\mathbf{B}, \tag{1.22}$$

$$\mathrm{div}\mathbf{w}=0,\quad \mathrm{div}\mathbf{B}=0. \tag{1.23}$$

In this paper we shall establish the above limit rigorously. Moreover, we shall show that for sufficiently small Mach number, the compressible flows admit a smooth solution on the time interval where the smooth solution of the incompressible MHD equations exists. In addition, we shall also study the low Mach number limit of the ideal compressible MHD equations (namely, $\mu=\lambda=\nu=\kappa=0$ in (1.1)–(1.4)) for which small pressure and entropy variations are assumed. The convergence rates are obtained in both cases.

We should point out here that it still remains to be an open problem to prove rigorously the low Mach number limit of the ideal or full non-isentropic MHD equations with large temperature variations in the framework of classical solutions, even in the whole space case, although the corresponding problems for the non-isentropic Euler and the full Navier-Stokes equations were solved in the whole space [1,25] or the bounded domain in [27]. The reason is that the presence of the magnetic field and its interaction with hydrodynamic motion in the MHD flow of large oscillation cause serious difficulties. We can not apply directly the techniques developed in [1,25,27] for the Euler and Navier-Stokes equations to obtain the uniform estimates for the solutions to the ideal or full non-isentropic MHD equations. In the present paper, however, we shall employ an alternative approach, which is based on the energy estimates for symmetrizable quasilinear hyperbolic-parabolic systems and the convergence-stability lemma for singular limit problems [3,30], to deal with the ideal or full non-isentropic MHD equations. There are two advantages of this approach: The first one is that we can rigorously prove the incompressible limit in the time interval where the limiting system admits a smooth solution. The second one is that the estimates we obtained do not depend on the viscosity and thermodynamic coefficients, compared with the results in [10] where all-time existence of smooth solutions to the full Navier-Stokes equations was discussed and the estimates depend on the parameters intimately.

For large entropy variation and general initial data, the authors have rigorously proved the low Mach number limit of the non-isentropic MHD equations with zero magnetic diffusivity in [18] by adapting and modifying the approach developed in [25]. We mention that the coupled singular limit problem for the full MHD equations in the framework of the so-called variational solutions were studied recently in [21, 26].

Before ending the introduction, we give the notations used throughout the current paper. We use the letter C to denote various positive constants independent of ϵ. For convenience, we denote by $H^l \equiv H^l(\Omega)$ $(l \in \mathbb{R})$ the standard Sobolev spaces and write $\|\cdot\|_l$ for the standard norm of H^l and $\|\cdot\|$ for $\|\cdot\|_0$.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we state our main results. The proof for the full MHD equations and the ideal MHD equations is presented in Section 3 and Section 4, respectively. Finally, an appendix is given to derive briefly the dimensionless form of the full compressible MHD equations.

2. Main results

We first recall the local existence of strong solutions to the incompressible MHD equations (1.21)–(1.23) in the domain Ω. The proof can be found in [7, 28]. Recall here that $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^3$ or $\Omega = \mathbb{T}^3$.

Proposition 2.1 ([7,28])**.** *Let* $s > 3/2+2$. *Assume that the initial data* $(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{B})|_{t=0} = (\mathbf{w}_0, \mathbf{B}_0)$ *satisfy* $\mathbf{w}_0 \in H^s, \mathbf{B}_0 \in H^s$, *and* $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{w}_0 = 0$, $\operatorname{div}\mathbf{B}_0 = 0$. *Then, there exist a* $\hat{T}^* \in (0, \infty]$ *and a unique solution* $(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{B}) \in L^\infty(0, \hat{T}^*; H^s)$ *to the incompressible MHD equations* (1.21)–(1.23), *and for any* $0 < T < \hat{T}^*$,

$$\sup_{0\leq t\leq T}\big\{||(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{B})(t)||_{H^s} + ||(\partial_t \mathbf{w}, \partial_t \mathbf{B})(t)||_{H^{s-2}} + ||\nabla \pi(t)||_{H^{s-2}}\big\} \leq C.$$

Denoting $U^\epsilon = (q^\epsilon, \mathbf{u}^\epsilon, \mathbf{H}^\epsilon, \phi^\epsilon)^\top$, we rewrite the system (1.17)–(1.19) in the vector form

$$A_0(U^\epsilon)\partial_t U^\epsilon + \sum_{j=1}^{3} A_j(U^\epsilon)\partial_j U^\epsilon = Q(U^\epsilon), \tag{2.1}$$

where

$$Q(U^\epsilon) = \big(0, F(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon), \nu\Delta\mathbf{H}^\epsilon, \kappa\Delta\phi^\epsilon + \epsilon(L(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon) + G(\mathbf{H}^\epsilon))\big)^\top,$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
F(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon) &= 2\mu \operatorname{div}(\mathbb{D}(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon)) + \lambda\nabla(\operatorname{tr}\mathbb{D}(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon)),\\
L(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon) &= 2\mu|\mathbb{D}(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon)|^2 + \lambda(\operatorname{tr}\mathbb{D}(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon))^2,\\
G(\mathbf{H}^\epsilon) &= \nu|\nabla \times \mathbf{H}^\epsilon|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

and the matrices $A_j(U^\epsilon)$ $(0 \leq j \leq 3)$ are given by

$$A_0(U^\epsilon) = \mathrm{diag}(1, 1+\epsilon q^\epsilon, 1+\epsilon q^\epsilon, 1+\epsilon q^\epsilon, 1, 1, 1, 1+\epsilon q^\epsilon),$$

$$A_1(U^\epsilon) =$$

$$\begin{pmatrix}
u_1^\epsilon & \frac{1+\epsilon q^\epsilon}{\epsilon} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\frac{1+\epsilon\phi^\epsilon}{\epsilon} & u_1^\epsilon(1+\epsilon q^\epsilon) & 0 & 0 & 0 & H_2^\epsilon & H_3^\epsilon & \frac{1+\epsilon q^\epsilon}{\epsilon} \\
0 & 0 & u_1^\epsilon(1+\epsilon q^\epsilon) & 0 & 0 & -H_1^\epsilon & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & u_1^\epsilon(1+\epsilon q^\epsilon) & 0 & 0 & -H_1^\epsilon & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & u_1^\epsilon & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & H_2^\epsilon & -H_1^\epsilon & 0 & 0 & u_1^\epsilon & 0 & 0 \\
0 & H_3^\epsilon & 0 & -H_1^\epsilon & 0 & 0 & u_1^\epsilon & 0 \\
0 & \frac{(\gamma-1)(1+\epsilon q^\epsilon)(1+\epsilon\phi^\epsilon)}{\epsilon} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & (1+\epsilon q^\epsilon)u_1^\epsilon
\end{pmatrix},$$

$$A_2(U^\epsilon) =$$

$$\begin{pmatrix}
u_2^\epsilon & 0 & \frac{1+\epsilon q^\epsilon}{\epsilon} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & u_2^\epsilon(1+\epsilon q^\epsilon) & 0 & 0 & -H_2^\epsilon & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\frac{1+\epsilon\phi^\epsilon}{\epsilon} & 0 & u_2^\epsilon(1+\epsilon q^\epsilon) & 0 & H_1^\epsilon & 0 & H_3^\epsilon & \frac{1+\epsilon q^\epsilon}{\epsilon} \\
0 & 0 & 0 & u_2^\epsilon(1+\epsilon q^\epsilon) & 0 & 0 & -H_2^\epsilon & 0 \\
0 & -H_2^\epsilon & H_1^\epsilon & 0 & u_2^\epsilon & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & u_2^\epsilon & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & H_3^\epsilon & -H_2^\epsilon & 0 & 0 & u_2 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \frac{(\gamma-1)(1+\epsilon q^\epsilon)(1+\epsilon\phi^\epsilon)}{\epsilon} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & (1+\epsilon q^\epsilon)u_2^\epsilon
\end{pmatrix},$$

$$A_3(U^\epsilon) =$$

$$\begin{pmatrix}
u_3^\epsilon & 0 & 0 & \frac{1+\epsilon q^\epsilon}{\epsilon} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & u_3^\epsilon(1+\epsilon q^\epsilon) & 0 & 0 & -H_3^\epsilon & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & u_3^\epsilon(1+\epsilon q^\epsilon) & 0 & 0 & -H_3^\epsilon & 0 & 0 \\
\frac{1+\epsilon\phi^\epsilon}{\epsilon} & 0 & 0 & u_3^\epsilon(1+\epsilon q^\epsilon) & H_1^\epsilon & H_2^\epsilon & 0 & \frac{1+\epsilon q^\epsilon}{\epsilon} \\
0 & -H_3^\epsilon & 0 & H_1^\epsilon & u_3^\epsilon & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & -H_3^\epsilon & H_2^\epsilon & 0 & u_3^\epsilon & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & u_3^\epsilon & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{(\gamma-1)(1+\epsilon q^\epsilon)(1+\epsilon\phi^\epsilon)}{\epsilon} & 0 & 0 & 0 & (1+\epsilon q^\epsilon)u_3^\epsilon
\end{pmatrix}.$$

It is easy to see that the matrices $A_j(U^\epsilon)$ $(0 \leq j \leq 3)$ can be symmetrized by choosing

$$\hat{A}_0(U^\epsilon) = \mathrm{diag}\big((1+\epsilon\phi^\epsilon)(1+\epsilon q^\epsilon)^{-1}, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, [(\gamma-1)(1+\epsilon\phi^\epsilon)]^{-1}\big).$$

Moreover, for $U^\epsilon \in \bar{G}_1 \subset\subset G$ with G being the state space for the system (2.1), $\hat{A}_0(U^\epsilon)$ is a positive definite symmetric matrix for sufficiently small ϵ.

Assume that the initial data $U^\epsilon(x,0) = U_0^\epsilon(x) = (q_0^\epsilon(x), \mathbf{u}_0^\epsilon(x), \mathbf{H}_0^\epsilon(x), \phi_0^\epsilon(x))^\top \in H^s$ and $U_0^\epsilon(x) \in G_0$, $\bar{G}_0 \subset\subset G$. The main theorem of the present paper is the following.

Theorem 2.2. *Let $s > 3/2 + 2$. Suppose that the initial data $U_0^\epsilon(x)$ satisfy*

$$\left\| U_0^\epsilon(x) - (0, \mathbf{w}_0(x), \mathbf{B}_0(x), 0)^\top \right\|_s = O(\epsilon).$$

Let $(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{B}, \pi)$ be a smooth solution to (1.21)–(1.23) obtained in Proposition 2.1. If $(\mathbf{w}, \pi) \in C([0,T^*], H^{s+2}) \cap C^1([0,T^*], H^s)$ with $T^* > 0$ finite, then there exists a constant $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that, for all $\epsilon \le \epsilon_0$, the system (2.1) with initial data $U_0^\epsilon(x)$ has a unique smooth solution $U^\epsilon(x,t) \in C([0,T^*], H^s)$. Moreover, there exists a positive constant $K > 0$, independent of ϵ, such that, for all $\epsilon \le \epsilon_0$,

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T^*]} \left\| U^\epsilon(\cdot,t) - \left(\frac{\epsilon}{2}\pi, \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{B}, \frac{\epsilon}{2}\pi\right)^\top \right\|_s \le K\epsilon. \tag{2.2}$$

Remark 2.1. From Theorem 2.2, we know that for sufficiently small ϵ and well-prepared initial data, the full MHD equations (1.1)–(1.4) admits a unique smooth solution on the same time interval where the smooth solution of the incompressible MHD equations exists. Moreover, the solution can be approximated as shown in (2.2).

Remark 2.2. We remark that the constant K in (2.2) is also independent of the coefficients μ, ν and κ. This is quite different from the results by Hagstorm and Loranz in [10], where the estimates do depend on μ intimately.

Our approach is still valid for the ideal compressible MHD equations. However, we will give a particular analysis for the ideal model with more general pressure by using the entropy form of the energy equation rather than the thermal energy equation in (1.8).

The ideal compressible MHD equations can be written as

$$\partial_t\rho + \mathrm{div}(\rho\mathbf{u}) = 0, \tag{2.3}$$

$$\partial_t(\rho\mathbf{u}) + \mathrm{div}\,(\rho\mathbf{u}\otimes\mathbf{u}) + \nabla p = \frac{1}{4\pi}(\nabla\times\mathbf{H})\times\mathbf{H}, \tag{2.4}$$

$$\partial_t\mathbf{H} - \nabla\times(\mathbf{u}\times\mathbf{H}) = 0, \quad \mathrm{div}\mathbf{H} = 0, \tag{2.5}$$

$$\partial_t\mathcal{E} + \mathrm{div}\,(\mathbf{u}(\mathcal{E}' + p)) = \frac{1}{4\pi}\mathrm{div}\big((\mathbf{u}\times\mathbf{H})\times\mathbf{H}\big). \tag{2.6}$$

With the help of the Gibbs relation

$$\theta \mathrm{d}S = \mathrm{d}e + p\,\mathrm{d}\left(\frac{1}{\rho}\right)$$

and the identity (1.7), the energy balance equation (2.6) is replaced by

$$\partial_t(\rho S) + \mathrm{div}(\rho S\mathbf{u}) = 0, \tag{2.7}$$

where S denotes the entropy. We reconsider the equation of state as a function of S and p, i.e. $\rho = R(S,p)$ for some positive smooth function R defined for all S and $p>0$, and satisfying $\frac{\partial R}{\partial p}>0$. Then, by utilizing (2.3), (1.15) and (1.16), together with the constraint $\mathrm{div}\mathbf{H}=0$, the system (2.3)–(2.5) and (2.7) can be written in the dimensionless form as follows (after applying the arguments similar to those in the Appendix):

$$A(S^\epsilon,p^\epsilon)(\partial_t p^\epsilon+\mathbf{u}^\epsilon\cdot\nabla p^\epsilon)+\mathrm{div}\mathbf{u}^\epsilon=0, \tag{2.8}$$

$$R(S^\epsilon,p^\epsilon)(\partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon+\mathbf{u}^\epsilon\cdot\nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon)+\frac{\nabla p^\epsilon}{\epsilon^2}-\mathbf{H}^\epsilon\cdot\nabla\mathbf{H}^\epsilon+\frac{1}{2}\nabla(|\mathbf{H}^\epsilon|^2)=0, \tag{2.9}$$

$$\partial_t\mathbf{H}^\epsilon+\mathbf{u}^\epsilon\cdot\nabla\mathbf{H}^\epsilon+\mathrm{div}\mathbf{u}^\epsilon\mathbf{H}^\epsilon-\mathbf{H}^\epsilon\cdot\nabla\mathbf{u}^\epsilon=0,\quad \mathrm{div}\mathbf{H}^\epsilon=0, \tag{2.10}$$

$$\partial_t S^\epsilon+\mathbf{u}^\epsilon\cdot\nabla S^\epsilon=0, \tag{2.11}$$

where $A(S^\epsilon,p^\epsilon)=\frac{1}{R(S^\epsilon,p^\epsilon)}\frac{\partial R(S^\epsilon,p^\epsilon)}{\partial p^\epsilon}$.

To study the low Mach number limit of the above system, we introduce the transformation

$$p^\epsilon(x,t)=\underline{p}e^{\epsilon q^\epsilon(x,t)},\quad S^\epsilon(x,t)=\underline{S}+\epsilon\Theta^\epsilon(x,t), \tag{2.12}$$

where $\underline{p}$ and $\underline{S}$ are positive constants, to obtain that

$$a(\underline{S}+\epsilon\Theta^\epsilon,\epsilon q^\epsilon)(\partial_t q^\epsilon+\mathbf{u}^\epsilon\cdot\nabla q^\epsilon)+\frac{1}{\epsilon}\mathrm{div}\mathbf{u}^\epsilon=0, \tag{2.13}$$

$$r(\underline{S}+\epsilon\Theta^\epsilon,\epsilon q^\epsilon)(\partial_t \mathbf{u}^\epsilon+\mathbf{u}^\epsilon\cdot\nabla \mathbf{u}^\epsilon)+\frac{1}{\epsilon}\nabla q^\epsilon-\mathbf{H}^\epsilon\cdot\nabla\mathbf{H}^\epsilon+\frac{1}{2}\nabla(|\mathbf{H}^\epsilon|^2)=0, \tag{2.14}$$

$$\partial_t\mathbf{H}^\epsilon+\mathbf{u}^\epsilon\cdot\nabla\mathbf{H}^\epsilon+\mathrm{div}\mathbf{u}^\epsilon\mathbf{H}^\epsilon-\mathbf{H}^\epsilon\cdot\nabla\mathbf{u}^\epsilon=0,\quad \mathrm{div}\mathbf{H}^\epsilon=0, \tag{2.15}$$

$$\partial_t\Theta^\epsilon+\mathbf{u}^\epsilon\cdot\nabla\Theta^\epsilon=0, \tag{2.16}$$

where

$$a(S^\epsilon,\epsilon q^\epsilon)=A(S^\epsilon,\underline{p}e^{\epsilon q^\epsilon})\underline{p}e^{\epsilon q^\epsilon}=\frac{\underline{p}e^{\epsilon q^\epsilon}}{R(S^\epsilon,\underline{p}e^{\epsilon q^\epsilon})}\cdot\frac{\partial R(S^\epsilon,s)}{\partial s}\Big|_{s=\underline{p}e^{\epsilon q^\epsilon}},$$
$$r^\epsilon(S^\epsilon,\epsilon q^\epsilon)=\frac{R(S^\epsilon,\underline{p}e^{\epsilon q^\epsilon})}{\underline{p}e^{\epsilon q^\epsilon}}.$$

Making use of the fact that $\mathrm{curl}\,\nabla=0$ and letting $\epsilon\to0$ in (2.13) and (2.14), we formally deduce that $\mathrm{div}\mathbf{v}=0$ and

$$\mathrm{curl}\,\big(r(\underline{S},0)(\partial_t\mathbf{v}+\mathbf{v}\cdot\nabla\mathbf{v})-(\nabla\times\mathbf{J})\times\mathbf{J}\big)=0,$$

where we have supposed that the limits $\mathbf{u}^\epsilon\to\mathbf{v}$ and $\mathbf{H}^\epsilon\to\mathbf{J}$ exist. Thus, we can expect that the limiting system of (2.13)–(2.16) takes the form

$$r(\underline{S},0)(\partial_t\mathbf{v}+\mathbf{v}\cdot\nabla\mathbf{v})-(\nabla\times\mathbf{J})\times\mathbf{J}+\nabla\Pi=0, \tag{2.17}$$

$$\partial_t\mathbf{J}+\mathbf{v}\cdot\nabla\mathbf{J}-\mathbf{J}\cdot\nabla\mathbf{v}=0, \tag{2.18}$$

$$\mathrm{div}\mathbf{v}=0,\quad \mathrm{div}\mathbf{J}=0 \tag{2.19}$$

for some function Π.

In order to state our result, we first recall the local existence of strong solutions to the ideal incompressible MHD equations (2.17)–(2.19) in the domain Ω. The proof can be found in [7, 28].

Proposition 2.3 ([7,28]). *Let* $s > 3/2 + 1$. *Assume that the initial data* $(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{J})|_{t=0} = (\mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{J}_0)$ *satisfy* $\mathbf{v}_0 \in H^s, \mathbf{J}_0 \in H^s$, *and* $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_0 = 0$, $\operatorname{div}\mathbf{J}_0 = 0$. *Then, there exist a* $\tilde{T}^* \in (0, \infty]$ *and a unique smooth solution* $(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{J}) \in L^\infty(0, \tilde{T}^*; H^s)$ *to the incompressible MHD equations* (1.21)–(1.23), *and for any* $0 < T < \tilde{T}^*$,

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T} \left\{ ||(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{J})(t)||_{H^s} + ||(\partial_t \mathbf{v}, \partial_t \mathbf{J})(t)||_{H^{s-1}} + ||\nabla \Pi(t)||_{H^{s-1}} \right\} \le C.$$

In the vector form, we arrive at, for $V^\epsilon = (q^\epsilon, \mathbf{u}^\epsilon, \mathbf{H}^\epsilon, \Theta^\epsilon)^\top$, that

$$A_0(\epsilon\Theta^\epsilon, \epsilon q^\epsilon)\partial_t V^\epsilon + \sum_{j=1}^{3} \Big\{ u_j^\epsilon A_0(\epsilon\Theta^\epsilon, \epsilon q^\epsilon) + \epsilon^{-1} C_j + B_j(\mathbf{H}^\epsilon) \Big\} \partial_j V^\epsilon = 0, \tag{2.20}$$

where

$$A_0(\epsilon\Theta^\epsilon, \epsilon q^\epsilon) = \operatorname{diag}(a(S^\epsilon, \epsilon q^\epsilon), r(S^\epsilon, \epsilon q^\epsilon), r(S^\epsilon, \epsilon q^\epsilon), r(S^\epsilon, \epsilon q^\epsilon), 1, 1, 1, 1),$$

and C_j is symmetric constant matrix, and $B_j(\mathbf{H}^\epsilon)$ is a symmetric matrix of $\mathbf{H}^\epsilon$.

Assume that the initial data for the equations (2.20) satisfy

$$V_0^\epsilon(x) = (\tilde{q}_0^\epsilon(x), \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_0^\epsilon(x), \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_0^\epsilon(x), \tilde{\Theta}_0^\epsilon(x))^\top \in H^s, \quad \text{and} \quad V_0^\epsilon(x) \in G_0, \quad \bar{G}_0 \subset\subset G$$

with G being state space for (2.20). Thus, our result on the ideal compressible MHD equations reads as

Theorem 2.4. *Let* $s > 3/2 + 1$. *Suppose that the initial data* $V_0^\epsilon(x)$ *satisfy*

$$\left\| V_0^\epsilon(x) - (0, \mathbf{v}_0(x), \mathbf{J}_0(x), 0)^\top \right\|_s = O(\epsilon).$$

Let $(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{J}, \Pi)$ *be a smooth solution to* (2.17)–(2.19) *obtained in Proposition 2.3. If* $(\mathbf{v}, \Pi) \in C([0, \bar{T}_*], H^{s+1}) \cap C^1([0, \bar{T}_*], H^s)$ *with* $\bar{T}_* > 0$ *finite, then there exists a constant* $\epsilon_1 > 0$ *such that, for all* $\epsilon \le \epsilon_1$, *the system* (2.20) *with initial data* $V_0^\epsilon(x)$ *has a unique solution* $V^\epsilon(x, t) \in C([0, \bar{T}_*], H^s)$. *Moreover, there exists a positive constant* $K_1 > 0$ *such that, for all* $\epsilon \le \epsilon_1$,

$$\sup_{t\in[0,\bar{T}_*]} \left\| V^\epsilon(\cdot, t) - (\epsilon\Pi, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{J}, \epsilon\Pi)^\top \right\|_s \le K_1 \epsilon. \tag{2.21}$$

3. Proof of Theorem 2.2

This section is devoted to proving Theorem 2.2. First, following the proof of the local existence theory for the initial value problem of symmetrizable hyperbolic-parabolic systems by Volpert and Hudjaev in [29], we obtain that there exists a time interval $[0, T]$ with $T > 0$, so that the system (2.1) with initial data $U_0^\epsilon(x)$

has a unique classical solution $U^\epsilon(x,t)\in C([0,T],H^s)$ and $U^\epsilon(x,t)\in G_2$ with $\bar{G}_2\subset\subset G$. We remark that the crucial step in the proof of local existence result is to prove the uniform boundedness of the solutions. See also [19] for some relative results.

Now, define

$$T_\epsilon=\sup\{T>0: U^\epsilon(x,t)\in C([0,T],H^s), U^\epsilon(x,t)\in G_2, \forall\,(x,t)\in\Omega\times[0,T]\}.$$

Note that T_ϵ depends on ϵ and may tend to zero as ϵ goes to 0.

To show that $\underline{\lim}_{\epsilon\to 0}T_\epsilon>0$, we shall make use of the convergence-stability lemma which was established in [3, 30] for hyperbolic systems of balance laws. It is also implied in [30] that a convergence-stability lemma can be formulated as a part of (local) existence theories for any evolution equations. For the hyperbolic-parabolic system (2.1), we have the following convergence-stability lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $s>3/2+2$. Suppose that $U_0^\epsilon(x)\in G_0, \bar{G}_0\subset\subset G$, and $U_0^\epsilon(x)\in H^s$, and the following convergence assumption (A) holds.*

(A) There exists $T_\star>0$ and $U_\epsilon\in L^\infty(0,T_\star;H^s)$ for each ϵ, satisfying

$$\bigcup_{x,t,\epsilon}\{U_\epsilon(x,t)\}\subset\subset G,$$

such that for $t\in[0,\min\{T_\star,T_\epsilon\})$,

$$\sup_{x,t}|U^\epsilon(x,t)-U_\epsilon(x,t)|=o(1),\quad \sup_t\|U^\epsilon(x,t)-U_\epsilon(x,t)\|_s=O(1),\qquad \text{as } \epsilon\to 0.$$

Then, there exist an $\bar{\epsilon}>0$ such that, for all $\epsilon\in(0,\bar{\epsilon}]$, it holds that

$$T_\epsilon>T_\star.$$

To apply Lemma 3.1, we construct the approximation $U_\epsilon=(q_\epsilon,\mathbf{v}_\epsilon,\mathbf{B}_\epsilon,\phi_\epsilon)^\top$ with $q_\epsilon=\epsilon\pi/2, \mathbf{v}_\epsilon=\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{B}_\epsilon=\mathbf{B}$, and $\phi_\epsilon=\epsilon\pi/2$, where $(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{B},\pi)$ is the classical solution to the system (1.21)–(1.23) obtained in Proposition 2.1. It is easy to verify that U_ϵ satisfies

$$\partial_t q_\epsilon+\mathbf{v}_\epsilon\cdot\nabla q_\epsilon+\frac{1}{\epsilon}(1+\epsilon q_\epsilon)\mathrm{div}\mathbf{v}_\epsilon=\frac{\epsilon}{2}(\pi_t+\mathbf{w}\cdot\nabla\pi), \tag{3.1}$$

$$\begin{aligned}(1+\epsilon q_\epsilon)(\partial_t\mathbf{v}_\epsilon+\mathbf{v}_\epsilon\cdot\nabla\mathbf{v}_\epsilon)&+\frac{1}{\epsilon}\big[(1+\epsilon q_\epsilon)\nabla\phi_\epsilon+(1+\epsilon\phi_\epsilon)\nabla q_\epsilon\big]\\ &-\mathbf{B}_\epsilon\cdot\nabla\mathbf{B}_\epsilon+\frac{1}{2}\nabla(|\mathbf{B}_\epsilon|^2)=\mu\Delta\mathbf{v}_\epsilon+\frac{\epsilon^2}{2}\pi(\mathbf{w}_t+\mathbf{w}\cdot\nabla\mathbf{w}+\nabla\pi),\end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

$$\partial_t\mathbf{B}_\epsilon+\mathbf{v}_\epsilon\cdot\nabla\mathbf{B}_\epsilon+\mathrm{div}\mathbf{v}_\epsilon\mathbf{B}_\epsilon-\mathbf{B}_\epsilon\cdot\nabla\mathbf{v}_\epsilon=\nu\Delta\mathbf{B}_\epsilon,\quad \mathrm{div}\mathbf{B}_\epsilon=0, \tag{3.3}$$

$$\begin{aligned}(1+\epsilon q_\epsilon)(\partial_t\phi_\epsilon+\mathbf{v}_\epsilon\cdot\nabla\phi_\epsilon)&+\frac{\gamma-1}{\epsilon}(1+\epsilon q_\epsilon)(1+\epsilon\phi_\epsilon)\mathrm{div}\mathbf{v}_\epsilon\\ &=\left(\frac{\epsilon}{2}+\frac{\epsilon^3}{4}\pi\right)(\pi_t+\mathbf{w}\cdot\nabla\pi).\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

We rewrite the system (3.1)–(3.4) in the following vector form

$$A_0(U_\epsilon)\partial_t U_\epsilon + \sum_{j=1}^{3} A_j(U_\epsilon)\partial_j U_\epsilon = S(U_\epsilon) + R, \tag{3.5}$$

with $S(U_\epsilon) = (0, \mu\Delta\mathbf{v}_\epsilon, \nu\Delta\mathbf{B}_\epsilon, 0)^\top$ and

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\epsilon}{2}(\pi_t + \mathbf{w}\cdot\nabla\pi) \\ \frac{\epsilon^2}{2}\pi(\mathbf{w}_t + \mathbf{w}\cdot\nabla\mathbf{w} + \nabla\pi) \\ \big(\frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon^3}{4}\pi\big)(\pi_t + \mathbf{w}\cdot\nabla\pi) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Due to the regularity assumptions on $(\mathbf{w}, \pi)$ in Theorem 2.2, we have

$$\max_{t\in[0,T^*]} \|R(t)\|_s \le C\epsilon.$$

To prove Theorem 2.2, it suffices to prove the error estimate in (2.2) for $t \in [0, \min\{T^*, T_\epsilon\})$ thanks to Lemma 3.1. To this end, introducing

$$E = U^\epsilon - U_\epsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{A}_j(U) = A_0^{-1}(U)A_j(U),$$

and using (2.1) and (3.5), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} E_t + \sum_{j=1}^{3}\mathcal{A}_j(U^\epsilon)E_{x_j} =& (\mathcal{A}_j(U_\epsilon) - \mathcal{A}_j(U^\epsilon))U_{\epsilon x_j} + A_0^{-1}(U^\epsilon)Q(U^\epsilon) \\ & - A_0^{-1}(U_\epsilon)(S(U_\epsilon) + R). \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

For any multi-index α satisfying $|\alpha| \le s$, we take the operator D^α to (3.6) to obtain

$$\partial_t D^\alpha E + \sum_{j=1}^{3}\mathcal{A}_j(U^\epsilon)\partial_{x_j}D^\alpha E = P_1^\alpha + P_2^\alpha + Q^\alpha + R^\alpha \tag{3.7}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} P_1^\alpha &= \sum_{j=1}^{3}\{\mathcal{A}_j(U^\epsilon)\partial_{x_j}D^\alpha E - D^\alpha(\mathcal{A}_j(U^\epsilon)\partial_{x_j}E)\}, \\ P_2^\alpha &= \sum_{j=1}^{3} D^\alpha\{(\mathcal{A}_j(U_\epsilon) - \mathcal{A}_j(U^\epsilon))U_{\epsilon x_j}\}, \\ Q^\alpha &= D^\alpha\{A_0^{-1}(U^\epsilon)Q(U^\epsilon) - A_0^{-1}(U_\epsilon)S(U_\epsilon)\}, \\ R^\alpha &= D^\alpha\{A_0^{-1}(U_\epsilon)R\}. \end{aligned}$$

Define

$$\tilde{A}_0(U^\epsilon) = \operatorname{diag}\Big(\frac{1+\epsilon\phi^\epsilon}{(1+\epsilon q^\epsilon)^2}, 1, 1, 1, \frac{1}{1+\epsilon q^\epsilon}, \frac{1}{1+\epsilon q^\epsilon}, \frac{1}{1+\epsilon q^\epsilon}, \frac{1}{(\gamma-1)(1+\epsilon\phi^\epsilon)}\Big),$$

and the canonical energy by

$$\|E\|_{\mathrm{e}}^2 := \int \langle \tilde{A}_0(U^\epsilon)E, E\rangle dx.$$

Note that $\tilde{A}_0(U^\epsilon)$ is a positive definite symmetric matrix and $\tilde{A}_0(U^\epsilon)\mathcal{A}_j(U^\epsilon)$ is symmetric. Now, if we multiply (3.7) with $\tilde{A}_0(U^\epsilon)$ and take the inner product between the resulting system and $D^\alpha E$, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\|D^\alpha E\|_{\mathrm{e}}^2 =& 2\int \langle \Gamma D^\alpha E, D^\alpha E\rangle dx\\ &+ 2\int (D^\alpha E)^T \tilde{A}_0(U^\epsilon)(P_1^\alpha + P_2^\alpha + Q^\alpha + R^\alpha),\end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

where

$$\Gamma = (\partial_t, \nabla)\cdot\Big(\tilde{A}_0, \tilde{A}_0(U^\epsilon)\mathcal{A}_1(U^\epsilon), \tilde{A}_0(U^\epsilon)\mathcal{A}_2(U^\epsilon), \tilde{A}_0(U^\epsilon)\mathcal{A}_3(U^\epsilon)\Big).$$

Next, we estimate various terms on the right-hand side of (3.8). Note that our estimates only need to be done for $t \in [0, \min\{T^*, T_\epsilon\})$, in which both U^ϵ and U_ϵ are regular enough and take values in a convex compact subset of the state space. Thus, we have

$$C^{-1}\int |D^\alpha E|^2 \le \|D^\alpha E\|_{\mathrm{e}}^2 \le C\int |D^\alpha E|^2 \tag{3.9}$$

and

$$|(D^\alpha E)^\top \tilde{A}_0(U^\epsilon)(P_1^\alpha + P_2^\alpha + R^\alpha)| \le C(|D^\alpha E|^2 + |P_1^\alpha|^2 + |P_2^\alpha|^2 + |R^\alpha|^2).$$

To estimate Γ, we write $\mathcal{A}_j(U^\epsilon) = u_j^\epsilon \mathbf{I}_8 + \bar{\mathcal{A}}_j(U^\epsilon)$. Notice that $\bar{\mathcal{A}}_j(U^\epsilon)$ depends only on $q^\epsilon, \phi^\epsilon$ and $\mathbf{H}^\epsilon$. Thus using (1.17) and (1.19), we have

$$\begin{aligned}|\Gamma| =& \Big|\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\tilde{A}_0 + u_j^\epsilon\cdot\nabla\tilde{A}_0 + \tilde{A}_0\mathrm{div}\mathbf{u}^\epsilon + \mathrm{div}(\tilde{A}_0\bar{\mathcal{A}}_j(U^\epsilon))\Big|\\ =& \big|\tilde{A}_0\,\mathrm{div}\mathbf{u}^\epsilon - \tilde{A}_{0\eta_1}^{'}(1+\epsilon q^\epsilon)\mathrm{div}\mathbf{u}^\epsilon - \tilde{A}_{0\eta_2}^{'}[(1+\epsilon\phi^\epsilon)\mathrm{div}\mathbf{u}^\epsilon + \kappa(1+\epsilon q^\epsilon)^{-1}\Delta\phi^\epsilon\\ &+ \epsilon^2(L(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon) + G(\mathbf{H}^\epsilon))] + \mathrm{div}(\tilde{A}_0\bar{\mathcal{A}}_j(U^\epsilon))\big|\\ \le& C + C(|\nabla\mathbf{u}^\epsilon| + |\nabla q^\epsilon| + |\nabla\phi^\epsilon| + |\nabla\mathbf{H}^\epsilon| + |\Delta\phi^\epsilon| + |\nabla\mathbf{u}^\epsilon|^2 + |\nabla\mathbf{H}^\epsilon|^2)\\ \le& C + C(|\nabla E| + |\nabla E|^2) + C|\Delta(\phi^\epsilon - \phi_\epsilon)| + C(|\nabla U_\epsilon| + |\nabla U_\epsilon|^2)\\ \le& C + C(\|E\|_s + \|E\|_s^2),\end{aligned}$$

where we have used Sobolev's embedding theorem and the fact that $s > 3/2 + 2$, and the symbols $\tilde{A}_{0\eta_1}^{'}$ and $\tilde{A}_{0\eta_2}^{'}$ denote the differentiation of $\tilde{A}_0$ with respect to ρ^ϵ and θ^ϵ, respectively.

Since

$$\mathcal{A}_j(U^\epsilon)\partial_{x_j}D^\alpha E - D^\alpha(\mathcal{A}_j(U^\epsilon)\partial_{x_j}E) = -\sum_{0<\beta\le\alpha}\binom{\alpha}{\beta}\partial^\beta\mathcal{A}_j(U^\epsilon)\partial^{\alpha-\beta}E_{x_j}$$

$$= -\sum_{0<\beta\leq\alpha}\binom{\alpha}{\beta}\partial^{\beta}[u_j^{\epsilon}\mathbf{I}_8+\bar{\mathcal{A}}_j(U^{\epsilon})]\partial^{\alpha-\beta}E_{x_j},$$

we obtain, with the help of the Moser-type calculus inequalities in Sobolev spaces, that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|P_1^{\alpha}\| \leq & C\left\{(1+\|(\mathbf{u}^{\epsilon},\mathbf{H}^{\epsilon})\|_s)\|E_{x_j}\|_{|\alpha|-1}+\|\epsilon^{-1}(\partial^{\beta}f(q^{\epsilon},\phi^{\epsilon})\partial^{\alpha-\beta}E_{x_j})\|\right\}\\
&+C\|\partial^{\beta}[(1+\epsilon q^{\epsilon})^{-1}(\mathbf{H}^{\epsilon}-\mathbf{B}_{\epsilon})+((1+\epsilon q^{\epsilon})^{-1}-(1+\epsilon q_{\epsilon})^{-1})\mathbf{B}_{\epsilon}]\partial^{\alpha-\beta}E_{x_j}\|\\
\leq & C(1+\|E\|_s+\|(q^{\epsilon},\phi^{\epsilon})\|_s^s)\|E_{x_j}\|_{|\alpha|-1}\\
\leq & C(1+\|E\|_s^s)\|E_{x_j}\|_{|\alpha|},
\end{aligned}$$

where $f(q^{\epsilon},\phi^{\epsilon})=(1+\epsilon q^{\epsilon})+(\gamma-1)(1+\epsilon\phi^{\epsilon})+(1+\epsilon q^{\epsilon})^{-1}(1+\epsilon\phi^{\epsilon})$.

Similarly, utilizing the boundedness of $\|U_{\epsilon}\|_{s+1}$, the term P_2^{α} can be bounded as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|P_2^{\alpha}\| &\leq C\|U_{\epsilon x_j}\|_s\|\mathcal{A}_j(U_{\epsilon})-\mathcal{A}_j(U^{\epsilon})\|_{|\alpha|}\\
&\leq C\|(u_j^{\epsilon}-v_{\epsilon j})\mathbf{I}_8+\bar{\mathcal{A}}_j(U^{\epsilon})-\bar{\mathcal{A}}_j(U_{\epsilon})\|_{|\alpha|}\\
&\leq C(1+\|\mathbf{u}^{\epsilon}-\mathbf{v}_{\epsilon}\|_{|\alpha|}+\|\mathbf{H}^{\epsilon}-\mathbf{B}_{\epsilon}\|_{|\alpha|})+C\|\epsilon^{-1}(f(q^{\epsilon},\phi^{\epsilon})-f(q_{\epsilon},\phi_{\epsilon}))\|_{|\alpha|}\\
&\leq C(1+\|q_{\epsilon}+\eta_3(q^{\epsilon}-q_{\epsilon})+\phi_{\epsilon}+\eta_4(\phi^{\epsilon}-\phi_{\epsilon})\|_s^s)\|E\|_{|\alpha|}\\
&\leq C(1+\|E\|_s^s)\|E\|_{|\alpha|},
\end{aligned}$$

where $0\leq\eta_3,\eta_4\leq 1$ are constants.

The estimate of $\int(D^{\alpha}E)^{\top}\tilde{A}_0(U^{\epsilon})Q^{\alpha}$ is more complex and delicate. First, we can rewrite $\int(D^{\alpha}E)^{\top}\tilde{A}_0(U^{\epsilon})Q^{\alpha}$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int(D^{\alpha}E)^{\top}\tilde{A}_0(U^{\epsilon})Q^{\alpha}=\int D^{\alpha}(\mathbf{u}^{\epsilon}-\mathbf{v}_{\epsilon})D^{\alpha}\left[(1+\epsilon q^{\epsilon})^{-1}F(\mathbf{u}^{\epsilon})-\mu(1+\epsilon q_{\epsilon})^{-1}\Delta\mathbf{v}_{\epsilon}\right]\\
&\quad+\nu\int D^{\alpha}(\mathbf{H}^{\epsilon}-\mathbf{B}_{\epsilon})(1+\epsilon q^{\epsilon})^{-1}D^{\alpha}(\Delta\mathbf{H}^{\epsilon}-\Delta\mathbf{B}_{\epsilon})\\
&\quad+\kappa(\gamma-1)^{-1}\int D^{\alpha}(\phi^{\epsilon}-\phi_{\epsilon})(1+\epsilon\phi^{\epsilon})^{-1}D^{\alpha}\{(1+\epsilon q)^{-1}\Delta\phi^{\epsilon}-(1+\epsilon q_{\epsilon})^{-1}\Delta\phi_{\epsilon}\}\\
&\quad+\epsilon(\gamma-1)^{-1}\int D^{\alpha}(\phi^{\epsilon}-\phi_{\epsilon})(1+\epsilon\phi^{\epsilon})^{-1}D^{\alpha}\{(1+\epsilon q^{\epsilon})^{-1}(L(\mathbf{u}^{\epsilon})+G(\mathbf{H}^{\epsilon}))\}\\
&=\mathcal{Q}_u+\mathcal{Q}_H+\mathcal{Q}_{\phi_1}+\mathcal{Q}_{\phi_2}.
\end{aligned}$$

By integration by parts, the Cauchy and Moser-type inequalities, and Sobolev's embedding theorem, we find that $\mathcal{Q}_u$ can be controlled as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Q}_u=&\int D^{\alpha}(\mathbf{u}^{\epsilon}-\mathbf{v}_{\epsilon})D^{\alpha}\{(1+\epsilon q^{\epsilon})^{-1}\mu\Delta(\mathbf{u}^{\epsilon}-\mathbf{v}_{\epsilon})+(\mu+\lambda)\nabla\mathrm{div}(\mathbf{u}^{\epsilon}-\mathbf{v}_{\epsilon})\}\\
&+\mu\int D^{\alpha}(\mathbf{u}^{\epsilon}-\mathbf{v}_{\epsilon})D^{\alpha}\{[(1+\epsilon q^{\epsilon})^{-1}-(1+\epsilon q_{\epsilon})^{-1}]\Delta\mathbf{v}_{\epsilon}\}\\
\leq&-\int\frac{\mu}{1+\epsilon q^{\epsilon}}|D^{\alpha}\nabla(\mathbf{u}^{\epsilon}-\mathbf{v}_{\epsilon})|^2-\int\frac{\mu+\lambda}{1+\epsilon q^{\epsilon}}|D^{\alpha}\mathrm{div}(\mathbf{u}^{\epsilon}-\mathbf{v}_{\epsilon})|^2
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\int D^\alpha(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon-\mathbf{v}_\epsilon)\sum_{0<\beta\le\alpha}D^\beta[(1+\epsilon q^\epsilon)^{-1}]D^{\alpha-\beta}\{\mu\Delta(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon-\mathbf{v}_\epsilon)\\
&+(\mu+\lambda)\nabla\mathrm{div}(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon-\mathbf{v}_\epsilon)\}+C\|E\|_{|\alpha|}^2+C\|E\|_s^4+C\epsilon\|D^\alpha\nabla(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon-\mathbf{v}_\epsilon)\|^2\\
\le&-C\int\mu|D^\alpha\nabla(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon-\mathbf{v}_\epsilon)|^2-C\int(\mu+\lambda)|D^\alpha\mathrm{div}(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon-\mathbf{v}_\epsilon)|^2+C\|E\|_{|\alpha|}^2\\
&+C\epsilon\|D^\alpha\nabla(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon-\mathbf{v}_\epsilon)\|^2+C\|E\|_s^4+C\|E\|_s^2\|E\|_{|\alpha|}^2+\int D^\alpha(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon-\mathbf{v}_\epsilon)\cdot\\
&\quad\sum_{1<\beta\le\alpha}D^\beta[(1+\epsilon q^\epsilon)^{-1}]D^{\alpha-\beta}\{\mu\Delta(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon-\mathbf{v}_\epsilon)+(\mu+\lambda)\nabla\mathrm{div}(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon-\mathbf{v}_\epsilon)\}\\
\le&-C\int\mu|D^\alpha\nabla(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon-\mathbf{v}_\epsilon)|^2-C\int(\mu+\lambda)|D^\alpha\mathrm{div}(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon-\mathbf{v}_\epsilon)|^2\\
&+C\epsilon\|D^\alpha\nabla(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon-\mathbf{v}_\epsilon)\|^2+C\|E\|_s^4+C\|E\|_{|\alpha|}^2.
\end{aligned}
$$

Similarly, the terms $\mathcal{Q}_H$, $\mathcal{Q}_{\phi_1}$ and $\mathcal{Q}_{\phi_2}$ can be bounded as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{Q}_H\le -C\nu\int|D^\alpha\nabla(\mathbf{H}^\epsilon-\mathbf{B}_\epsilon)|^2+C\epsilon\|D^\alpha\nabla(\mathbf{H}^\epsilon-\mathbf{B}_\epsilon)\|^2+C\|E\|_s^4+C\|E\|_{|\alpha|}^2,\\
&\mathcal{Q}_{\phi_1}\le -C\kappa\int|D^\alpha\nabla(\phi^\epsilon-\phi_\epsilon)|^2+C\epsilon\|D^\alpha\nabla(\phi^\epsilon-\phi_\epsilon)\|^2+C\|E\|_s^4+C\|E\|_{|\alpha|}^2
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\mathcal{Q}_{\phi_2}\le C\epsilon\|D^\alpha\nabla(\phi^\epsilon-\phi_\epsilon)\|^2+C\|E\|_s^4+C\|E\|_{|\alpha|}^2.
$$

Putting all the above estimates into (3.8) and taking ϵ small enough, we obtain that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt}\|D^\alpha E\|_{\mathrm{e}}^2+\xi\int|D^\alpha\nabla(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon-\mathbf{v}_\epsilon)|^2+\nu\int|D^\alpha\nabla(\mathbf{H}^\epsilon-\mathbf{B}_\epsilon)|^2\\
&\quad+\kappa\int|D^\alpha\nabla(\phi^\epsilon-\phi_\epsilon)|^2\le C\|R^\alpha\|^2+C(1+\|E\|_s^{2s})\|E\|_{|\alpha|}^2+\|E\|_s^4,
\end{aligned}\tag{3.10}
$$

where we have used the following estimate

$$
\mu\int|D^\alpha\nabla(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon-\mathbf{v}_\epsilon)|^2+(\mu+\lambda)\int|D^\alpha\mathrm{div}(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon-\mathbf{v}_\epsilon)|^2\ge\xi\int|D^\alpha\nabla(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon-\mathbf{v}_\epsilon)|^2
$$

for some positive constant $\xi>0$.

Using (3.9), we integrate the inequality (3.10) over $(0,t)$ with $t<\min\{T_\epsilon,T^*\}$ to obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|D^\alpha E(t)\|^2\le&C\|D^\alpha E(0)\|^2+C\int_0^t\|R^\alpha(\tau)\|^2d\tau\\
&+C\int_0^t\{(1+\|E\|_s^{2s})\|E\|_{|\alpha|}^2+\|E\|_s^4\}(\tau)d\tau.
\end{aligned}
$$

Summing up this inequality for all α with $|\alpha|\le s$, we get

$$
\|E(t)\|_s^2\le C\|E(0)\|_s^2+C\int_0^{T^*}\|R(\tau)\|_s^2d\tau+C\int_0^t\{(1+\|E\|_s^{2s})\|E\|_s^2\}(\tau)d\tau.
$$

With the help of Gronwall's lemma and the fact that

$$\|E(0)\|_s^2 + \int_0^{T^*} \|R(t)\|_s^2 dt = O(\epsilon^2),$$

we conclude that

$$\|E(t)\|_s^2 \le C\epsilon^2 \exp\left\{ C\int_0^t (1 + \|E(\tau)\|_s^{2s}) d\tau \right\} \equiv \Phi(t).$$

It is easy to see that $\Phi(t)$ satisfies

$$\Phi'(t) = C(1 + \|E(t)\|_s^{2s})\Phi(t) \le C\Phi(t) + C\Phi^{s+1}(t).$$

Thus, employing the nonlinear Gronwall-type inequality, we conclude that there exists a constant K, independent of ϵ, such that

$$\|E(t)\|_s \le K\epsilon,$$

for all $t \in [0, \min\{T_\epsilon, T^*\})$, provided $\Phi(0) = C\epsilon^2 < \exp(-CT^*)$. Thus, the proof is completed.

4. Proof of Theorem 2.4

The proof of Theorem 2.4 is essentially similar to that of Theorem 2.2, and we only give some explanations here. The local existence of classical solution to the system (2.20) is given by the proof of Theorem 2.1 in [24]. For each fixed ϵ, we assume that the maximal time interval of existence is $[0, T^\epsilon)$. To prove Theorem 2.4, it is crucial to obtain the error estimates in (2.21). For this purpose, we construct the approximation $V_\epsilon = (q_\epsilon, \mathbf{v}_\epsilon, \mathbf{J}_\epsilon, \Theta_\epsilon)^\top$ with $q_\epsilon = \epsilon\Pi, \mathbf{v}_\epsilon = \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{J}_\epsilon = \mathbf{J}$, and $\Theta_\epsilon = \epsilon\Pi$. It is then easy to verify that V_ϵ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} a(\underline{S} + \epsilon\Theta_\epsilon, \epsilon q_\epsilon)(\partial_t q_\epsilon + \mathbf{v}_\epsilon \cdot \nabla q_\epsilon) + \frac{1}{\epsilon}\mathrm{div}\mathbf{v}_\epsilon& \\ = \epsilon a(\underline{S} + \epsilon^2\Pi, \epsilon^2\Pi)(\Pi_t + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla\Pi),& \qquad (4.1) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} r(\underline{S} + \epsilon\Theta_\epsilon, \epsilon q_\epsilon)(\partial_t \mathbf{v}_\epsilon + \mathbf{v}_\epsilon \cdot \nabla\mathbf{v}_\epsilon) + \frac{1}{\epsilon}\nabla q_\epsilon - \mathbf{J}_\epsilon \cdot \nabla\mathbf{J}_\epsilon + \frac{1}{2}(|\mathbf{J}_\epsilon|^2)& \\ = [r(\underline{S} + \epsilon\Theta_\epsilon, \epsilon q_\epsilon) - r(\underline{S}, 0)](\mathbf{v}_t + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla\mathbf{v}),& \qquad (4.2) \end{aligned}$$

$$\partial_t \mathbf{J}_\epsilon + \mathbf{v}_\epsilon \cdot \nabla\mathbf{J}_\epsilon + \mathrm{div}\mathbf{v}_\epsilon\mathbf{J}_\epsilon - \mathbf{J}_\epsilon \cdot \nabla\mathbf{v}_\epsilon = 0, \quad \mathrm{div}\mathbf{J}_\epsilon = 0, \qquad (4.3)$$

$$\partial_t\Theta_\epsilon + \mathbf{v}_\epsilon \cdot \nabla\Theta_\epsilon = \epsilon(\Pi_t + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla\Pi). \qquad (4.4)$$

Thus we can rewrite (4.1)–(4.4) in the vector form of (2.20) with a source term. Letting $E = V^\epsilon - V_\epsilon$, we can perform the energy estimates similar to those in the proof of Theorem 2.2 to show Theorem 2.4. Here we omit the details of the proof for conciseness.

5. Appendix

We give a dimensionless form of the system (1.1)-(1.3) and (1.8) for the ionized fluid obeying the perfect gas relations (1.9) by following the spirit of [12]. Introduce the new dimensionless quantities:

$$x_\star = \frac{x}{L_0}, \quad t_\star = \frac{t}{L_0/u_0}, \quad \mathbf{u}_\star = \frac{\mathbf{u}}{u_0},$$
$$\mathbf{H}_\star = \frac{\mathbf{H}}{H_0}, \quad \rho_\star = \frac{\rho}{\rho_0}, \quad \theta_\star = \frac{\theta}{\theta_0},$$

where the subscripts 0 denote the corresponding typical values and $\star$ denotes dimensionless quantities. For convenience, all the coefficients are assumed to be constants. Thus, the dimensionless form of the system (1.1)–(1.3) and (1.8) is obtained by a direct computation:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial \rho_\star}{\partial t_\star} + \mathrm{div}_\star(\rho_\star \mathbf{u}_\star) = 0,\\
&\rho_\star \frac{d\mathbf{u}_\star}{dt_\star} + \frac{1}{M^2}\nabla_\star(\rho_\star\theta_\star) = C(\nabla_\star \times \mathbf{H}_\star) \times \mathbf{H}_\star + \frac{1}{R}\mathrm{div}_\star \Psi_\star,\\
&\rho_\star \frac{d\theta_\star}{dt_\star} + (\gamma-1)\rho_\star\theta_\star \mathrm{div}_\star \mathbf{u}_\star = \frac{(\gamma-1)}{R_m} CM^2 |\nabla_\star \times \mathbf{H}_\star|^2\\
&\qquad + \frac{(\gamma-1)M^2}{R}\Psi_\star : \nabla_\star \mathbf{u}_\star + \frac{\gamma}{RP_r}\Delta_\star\theta_\star,\\
&\frac{\partial \mathbf{H}_\star}{\partial t_\star} - \nabla_\star \times (\mathbf{u}_\star \times \mathbf{H}_\star) = \frac{1}{R_m}\nabla_\star \times (\nabla_\star \times \mathbf{H}_\star), \quad \mathrm{div}_\star \mathbf{H}_\star = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the material derivative

$$\frac{d}{dt_\star} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t_\star} + \mathbf{u}_\star \cdot \nabla_\star,$$

and the new viscous stress tensor

$$\Psi_\star = 2\mathbb{D}_\star(\mathbf{u}_\star) + \frac{\lambda}{\mu}\mathrm{div}_\star \mathbf{u}_\star\, \mathbf{I}_3$$

with $\mathbb{D}_\star(\mathbf{u}_\star) = (\nabla_\star \mathbf{u}_\star + \nabla_\star \mathbf{u}_\star^\top)/2$.

In the above dimensionless system, there are following dimensionless characteristic parameters:

Reynolds number: $R = \dfrac{\rho_0 u_0 L_0}{\mu}$, Mach number: $M = \dfrac{u_0}{a_0}$,

Prandtl number: $P_r = \dfrac{c_p \mu}{\kappa}$, magnetic Reynolds number: $R_m = \dfrac{v_0 L_0}{\nu}$,

Cowling number: $C = \dfrac{\mu H_0^2/4\pi\rho_0}{u_0^2}$,

where c_p is the specific heat at constant pressure and $a_0 = \sqrt{\Re\theta_0}$ is the sound speed. Note that $\Re = c_p - c_V$ and $\gamma = c_p/c_V$.

Acknowledgements: The authors are very grateful to the referees for their helpful suggestions. This work was partially done when Fucai Li was visiting the Institute of Applied Physics and Computational Mathematics in Beijing. He would like to thank the institute for hospitality. Jiang was supported by NSFC (Grant No. 40890154) and the National Basic Research Program under the Grant 2011CB309705. Ju was supported by NSFC (Grant No. 40890154 and 11171035). Li was supported by NSFC (Grant No. 10971094), PAPD, NCET, and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities.

References

[1] T. Alazard, Low Mach number limit of the full Navier-Stokes equations, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 180 (2006), 1-73.

[2] A. Blokhin, Yu. Trakhinin, Stability of strong discontinuities in fluids and MHD. In: Handbook of mathematical fluid dynamics. S. Friedlander, D. Serre, (eds.), vol. 1, 545-652, Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2002.

[3] Y. Brenier, W.-A. Yong, Derivation of particle, string, and membrane motions from the BornCInfeld electromagnetism, J. Math. Phys., 46 (2005), 062305, 17pp.

[4] G.Q. Chen and D.H. Wang, Global solutions of nonlinear magnetohydrodynamics with large initial data, J. Differential Equations, 182 (2002), no.1, 344-376.

[5] G.Q. Chen and D.H. Wang, Existence and continuous dependence of large solutions for the magnetohydrodynamic equations, Z. Angew. Math. Phys. 54 (2003), 608-632.

[6] B. Ducomet and E. Feireisl, The equations of magnetohydrodynamics: on the interaction between matter and radiation in the evolution of gaseous stars, Comm. Math. Phys. 266 (2006), 595-629.

[7] G. Duvaut, J.L. Lions, Inéquations en thermoélasticité et magnéto-hydrodynamique, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. 46 (1972) 241-279.

[8] J. Fan, S. Jiang and G. Nakamura, Vanishing shear viscosity limit in the magnetohydrodynamic equations, Comm. Math. Phys. 270 (2007), 691-708.

[9] H. Freistühler and P. Szmolyan, Existence and bifurcation of viscous profiles for all intermediate magnetohydrodynamic shock waves, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 26 (1995), 112-128.

[10] T. Hagstrom, J. Lorenz, On the stability of approximate solutions of hyperbolic-parabolic systems and the all-time existence of smooth, slightly compressible flows, Indiana Univ. Math. J., 51 (2002), 1339-1387.

[11] D. Hoff and E. Tsyganov, Uniqueness and continuous dependence of weak solutions in compressible magnetohydrodynamics, Z. Angew. Math. Phys. 56 (2005), 791-804.

[12] W. R. Hu, Cosmic Magnetohydrodynamics, Scientific Press, 1987. (in Chinese)

[13] X. P. Hu and D. H. Wang, Global solutions to the three-dimensional full compressible magnetohydrodynamic flows, Comm. Math. Phys. 283 (2008), 255-284.

[14] X. P. Hu and D. H. Wang, Low Mach number limit of viscous compressible magnetohydrodynamic flows, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 41 (2009), 1272–1294.

[15] A. Jeffrey and T. Taniuti, Non-Linear Wave Propagation. With applications to physics and magnetohydrodynamics. Academic Press, New York, 1964.

[16] S. Jiang, Q. C. Ju and F. C. Li, Incompressible limit of the compressible Magnetohydrodynamic equations with periodic boundary conditions, Comm. Math. Phys., 297 (2010), 371-400.

[17] S. Jiang, Q. C. Ju and F. C. Li, Incompressible limit of the compressible magnetohydrodynamic equations with vanishing viscosity coefficients, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 42 (2010), 2539-2553.

[18] S. Jiang, Q. C. Ju and F. C. Li, Incompressible limit of the compressible non-isentropic magnetohydrodynamic equations with zero magnetic diffusivity, available at: arXiv:1111.2926v1 [math.AP].

[19] Q. C. Ju, F. C. Li and H. L. Li, The quasineutral limit of compressible Navier-Stokes-Poisson system with heat conductivity and general initial data, J. Differential Equations, 247 (2009), 203-224.

[20] S. Klainerman, A. Majda, Singular perturbations of quasilinear hyperbolic systems with large parameters and the incompressible limit of compressible fluids, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 34 (1981) 481-524.

[21] P. Kukučka, Singular Limits of the Equations of Magnetohydrodynamics, J. Math. Fluid Mech., 13 (2011), 173-189.

[22] A. G. Kulikovskiy and G. A. Lyubimov, Magnetohydrodynamics, Addison-Wesley, Reading, Massachusetts, 1965.

[23] L. D. Laudau and E. M. Lifshitz, Electrodynamics of Continuous Media, 2nd ed., Pergamon, New York, 1984.

[24] A. Majda, Compressible Fluid Flow and Systems of Conservation Laws in Several space variables, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1984

[25] G. Métivier, S. Schochet, The incompressible limit of the non-isentropic Euler equations, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 158 (2001), 61-90..

[26] A. Novotny, M. Ruzicka and G. Thäter, Singular limit of the equations of magnetohydrodynamics in the presence of strong stratification, Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci., 21 (2011), 115-147.

[27] S. Schochet, The compressible Euler equations in a bounded domain: existence of solutions and the incompressible limit, Comm. Math. Phys., 104 (1986), 49-75.

[28] M. Sermange, R. Temam, Some mathematical questions related to the MHD equations, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 36 (1983), 635-664.

[29] A. I. Volpert, S. I. Hudjaev, On the Cauchy problem for composite systems of nonlinear differential equations. Mat. Sbornik 87 (1972), 504-528(Russian) [English transl.: Math. USSR, Sbornik 16(1973), 517-544.

[30] W. A. Yong, Basic aspects of hyperbolic relaxation systems, in Advances in the Theory of Shock Waves, H. Freistühler and A. Szepessy, eds., Progr. Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl. 47, Birkhäuser Boston, 2001, 259-305.

[31] J.W. Zhang, S. Jiang, F. Xie, Global weak solutions of an initial boundary value problem for screw pinches in plasma physics, Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci. 19 (2009), 833-875.

LCP, Institute of Applied Physics and Computational Mathematics, P..O. Box 8009, Beijing 100088, P.R. China
E-mail address: `jiang@iapcm.ac.cn`

Institute of Applied Physics and Computational Mathematics, P.O. Box 8009-28, Beijing 100088, P.R. China
E-mail address: `qiangchang_ju@yahoo.com`

Department of Mathematics, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210093, P.R. China
E-mail address: `fli@nju.edu.cn`